

Thierry Meynard*

Missionary Writings During the Canton Exile (1666–1671): Controversies on the Inculturation of the Catholic Church

<https://doi.org/10.1515/cwl-2024-2001>

Published online October 9, 2024



Abstract: In the aftermath of the Calendar Case, 25 missionaries arrived in Canton in March 1666. Over the course of their five-year exile, they generated numerous reports and letters which, until now, have not been subject to systematic study. This paper delves into their writings concerning the establishment of three practical norms for the China mission: permitting Chinese Catholics to observe traditional rites honoring their ancestors and Confucius, allowing them to continue fasting under certain conditions, and instructing them to wear a Chinese hat during the liturgy. Though these norms were ratified by majority vote, they were immediately met with opposition. Although the controversy on the Chinese rites is well-documented, it is pertinent to examine these three controversies together, as they pertain to the issue of inculturation within the Catholic Church.

Keywords: Jesuits; Canton; Chinese rites; inculturation

1 Introduction

From 17 December 1667 to 26 January 1668, European missionaries convened a formal conference in Canton, during which they approved practical norms (*praxes*) for the mission by majority vote. Among the most significant norms were those pertaining to the Chinese Rites, specifically allowing Chinese Catholics to observe traditional rituals honoring the ancestors and Confucius. The period of exile in Canton marks a crucial stage in the Rites Controversy, albeit one often overlooked by modern scholarship which tends to focus on later stages like the

***Corresponding author: Thierry Meynard**, Philosophy Department & Research Center on the Foreign Cultural Exchanges of Guangzhou, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China,
E-mail: meiqianl@mail.sysu.edu.cn

 Open Access. © 2024 the author(s), published by Walter De Gruyter GmbH on behalf of © Cowrie: Comparative and World Literature.  This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

edict in 1693 of the French Apostolic Vicar Charles Maigrot, MEP (1652–1730), or the ill-fated legation in 1702 of Charles-Thomas Maillard de Tournon (1668–1710). Only two missionaries in Canton voiced opposition to the Chinese Rites: the Franciscan Antonio de Santa María Caballero 利安當 (1602–1669) and the Dominican Domingo Navarrete 閔明我 (1610–1689). Despite the controversy's origins in the 1630s, many arguments on both sides were developed during the Canton exile, and significant evidence was presented, including translations of Chinese texts into European languages for the first time. This paper aims to systematically present the reports and letters sent to Macao, Manila and Europe, which capture the intense debates held in Canton. Missionaries articulated their positions, refuted adversaries' arguments, and sought to garner support from their religious congregations and the Vatican. Additionally, two minor controversies erupted, one concerning the admission to baptism of those observing fast, and another regarding the Chinese custom of covering the head during Mass. These secondary disputes offer insights into missionaries' perceptions of Chinese culture and society, and their vision for the Catholic Church's integration into China.

2 The Missionaries in Canton

Among the 25 missionaries who arrived in Canton on March 1666, the largest contingent consisted of 19 Jesuits belonging to the Vice-Province of China, with six French, five Italians, including two Sicilians attached to the Spanish crown (Francesco Brancati and Prospero Intorcetta), four Portuguese, three Flemish, and one Austrian. Several Jesuits, such as Michel Trigault, Pietro Canevari, Inácio da Costa and António de Gouvea, already possessed considerable experience, with more than 30 years in China. Notably, there was a significant contingent of 10 Jesuits with 10 years or less of experience in China. Among this younger generation, a few were particularly active proponents of the accommodation policy, especially Intorcetta the youngest of all, along with like-minded fellows like Couplet, Gabiani, Herdtrich and Rougemont. However, within the younger Jesuit cohort, a subgroup of four French Jesuits (Augery, the two Motel brothers, and especially Grelon) opposed the Chinese customs of covering the head and of observing fasts, while still accepting the Chinese Rites. The French Jesuit Jacques Le Faure served as Vice-Provincial in Canton until July 1666, when he was succeeded by the Portuguese Feliciano Pacheco. Below is the chart of the 19 Jesuits of the Vice-Province, arranged by age in 1666.

Name	Nation	Chinese name	Year of birth	Age/year of arrival in China	Province in China	Age at arrival in Canton	Age/year of death	Remarks
Gouvea, António de	Portugal	何大化	1592	44 1636	福建	74	85 1677	Shifted to Japanese Province and superior of the residence from July 1666; shifted back to Vice-Province, Vice-Provincial 1669–1672
Canevari, Pietro	Italy	聶伯多	1596	34 1630	杭州、福建、江西	70	79 1675	
Trigault, Michel	Flanders	金彌格	1602	28 1630	山西	64	65 1667.9.30	Died in Canton
Costa, Inácio da	Portugal	郭納爵	1603	30 1633	江西	63	63 1666.5.11	Died in Canton
Brancati, Francesco	Sicily	潘國光	1607	29 1636	上海	59		Died in Canton
De Ferrarils, Giovanni	Italy	李方西	1608	31 1640	陝西	57	1671.4.25 1671	Secretary of Vice-Provincial
Le Faure, Jacques	France	劉迪我	1613	43 1656	上海、福建、山東、南京	53	62 1675	Vice-Provincial until July 1666
Valat, Jean	France	汪儒望	1614	37 1651	山東	52	82 1696	
Augery, Humbert	France	洪度貞	1618	38 1656	浙江	48	55 1673	
Grelon, Adrien	France	聶仲遷	1618	38 1656	江西	48	77 1696	
Motel, Claude	France	穆格我	1618	39 1657	杭州、陝西	48	53 1671	

(continued)

Name	Nation	Chinese name	Year of birth	Age/year of arrival in China	Province in China	Age at arrival in Canton	Age/year of death	Remarks
Motel, Jacques	France	穆迪我	1619	37	湖北	47	73	
Jorge, Manuel	Portugal	張瑪諾	1621	1656 30	江南、南京	45	1692 56	
Pacheco, Feliciano	Portugal	成際理	1622	1651 29	上海、江南、淮安	44	1677 55	Vice-Provincial from July 1666 to July 1669
Gabiani, Giandomenico	Italy	畢嘉	1623	1651 33	江南	43	1687 71	Minister of the house
Couplet, Philippe	Flanders	柏應理	1623	1656 36	南京	43	1694 70	
Rougemont, François de Herdtrich, Christian	Flanders	魯日滿	1624	1659 34	南京	42	1693 52	
Intorcetta, Prospero	Austria	恩理格	1625	1658 35	山西、河南	41	1676 59	
	Sicily	殷鐸澤	1625	1660 34	江西	41	1684 72	Left Canton on 1.9.1668, replaced by Macret
				1659			1696	

In addition to the 19 Jesuits of the Vice-Province, there were two other Jesuits in Canton, but attached to the Japanese Province: the Italian Andrea-Giovanni Lubelli 陸安德 (1611–1685) and the Portuguese Stanislas Torrente 瞿篤德 (1616–1681). During the Canton exile, three members of the Japanese Province arrived from outside: in 1668, the Italian Carlo Della Rocca 石嘉樂 (1612–1670) arrived from Hainan, and in the summer of 1669, the Macanese Jesuit brother António Fernandez 蔡按鐸 (c. 1620–1670) and the Chinese priest Zheng Weixin 鄭惟信 (Zheng Manuo 鄭瑪諾; Manuel de Sequeira, 1633–1673) came together from Macao. Both Della Rocca and Cai Anduo died in Canton in 1670.

Since the city of Canton fell under the jurisdiction of the Jesuit Japanese Province, the Jesuits of the Vice-Province were guests of the Japanese Province in the Canton residence. With so many missionaries in residence, a man of experience was needed to be the superior of the community. The eldest Jesuit, the Portuguese Gouvea, was chosen as superior. Originally a member of the Vice-Province, Gouvea was transferred to the Japanese Province. However, three years later, in July 1669, he was named Vice-Provincial in replacement of Pacheco, and thus he returned to the Vice-Province.

Additionally, the Vice-Provincial of China and the Provincial of Japan were both placed under the supervision of a Visitor who reported directly to the Superior General in Rome. From 1664 to 1670, this role was held by the Portuguese Luís da Gama (1610–1672) who was based in Macao. The intricate hierarchy, where boundaries were not clearly delineated, led to numerous conflicts among the Jesuits.

In addition to the 21 Jesuits of the Vice-Province of China and of the Province of Japan, there were also one Franciscan and three Dominican friars. The Spanish Dominican Domingo Fernández de Navarrete (1618–1689) gained renown for his staunch opposition to the Chinese Rites. He had previously been active in Fujian and Zhejiang provinces. On 9 December 1669, he clandestinely departed Canton and returned to Europe, where he published works vehemently opposing the Chinese rites. Among the other Dominicans in Canton were the Spanish Felipe Leonardo 許斐錄 (1628–1677) and the Sicilian Domenico Sarpetri 薩佩裏 (1623–1682 or 1683). Both had served in Lanxi 蘭溪, Zhejiang province, where they were captured in 1665. On 13 April 1671, toward the end of the captivity in Canton, the Dominican Francisco Varo 萬濟國 (1627–1687) also arrived. Finally, there was the Spanish Franciscan Caballero, a veteran missionary who had arrived in China in 1633, boasting extensive experience in Shandong. He played a key role in the controversies of Canton and became a close associate of Navarrete in the fight against the Chinese Rites. He died in Canton on 13 May 1669.

The role of the few Chinese in the Canton residence was significant, although it remains poorly understood. As mentioned above, Zheng Weixin and Cai Anduo arrived in Canton in the summer of 1669. Zheng ministered to local Christians in the

Canton area, while Cai took care of the sick within the residence. The Catholic Paul Banhes 萬其淵 (1635–1700) also made notable contributions by printing two bilingual works in Chinese and Latin: the *Politico-Moralis* and the *Innocentia victrix*. From Navarrete's *Controversias*, we learn about the *xiucaí* 秀才 (*bachiller*) Marcos Zhang, a native of Nanjing baptized by Brancati, who arrived sometime after March 1666. Additionally, the Dominican Luo Wenzhao 羅文炤 (1617–1691) was the only Chinese priest before Zheng's return to China. Luo had the freedom to move and visited the missionaries held captive in Canton. Including a few cooks or helpers, the Canton residence housed approximatively 30 individuals during this period.

3 The Canton Conference and the Debates on the Chinese Rites

The Dominican, Franciscan, and Jesuit missionaries convened a formal conference from 17 December 1667 until 26 January 1668 to address pastoral issues. They were very much aware that some European ecclesiastical practices could not be used within the context of Chinese culture and society. Drawing from nearly a century of experience and trials, they thought the time ripe to establish norms. De Ferrariis was elected as secretary for the conference. Since the archives of the Vice-Province were originally kept in Macao, the Canton Jesuits requested their transfer to Canton. De Ferrariis undertook the task of classifying and copying the most important documents. Additionally, serving as assistant (*socius*) for the Vice-Provincial Pacheco and a member of his consult or council, De Ferrariis maintained close communication with the Visitor in Macao and bore witness to the conflicts between the Vice-Province and Da Gama.

The Canton Conference adopted the Practical Norms (*Praxes*) voted in the full assembly of 23 priests (and not 25 because Da Costa and Trigault had already died). These Practical Norms represented a significant milestone in the meticulous implementation of the accommodation policy. We shall not describe here the content which has been extensively studied by Yip (2012). Instead, we shall focus on the three controversial points: the Chinese Rites, the Chinese hat and the Chinese fasting.

The Jesuit Visitor Da Gama received from Pacheco the Practical Norms, along with the objections from Navarrete and Caballero, primarily concerning the Chinese Rites. Recognizing the validity of those objections, Da Gama requested Pacheco in Canton to answer to the treatises of Navarrete and Caballero and to seek reconciliation (*accommodar com nos*). On 10 December 1668, Da Gama authenticated five sets of the Practical Norms and of the accompanying documents, dispatching them to Rome via several maritime routes (Da Gama 1668).

Paul Rule has pointed out the existence of two versions of the Norms: one comprising 41 points and another 42 points, though Rule tends to minimize the difference as not substantial (Rule 2021, 142). The version in 42 points was, in fact, altered by Da Gama in the summer of 1668, and therefore not completely faithful to the resolutions of the Canton Conference, especially about how Chinese Catholics should mark their respect to God during Mass by wearing or not a hat (De Ferrariis 1668a). When the Canton missionaries learnt in September about the changes introduced by Da Gama without their knowledge and approval, they reverted to their original resolutions but wanted to express them with more clarity. They reorganized the initial three points about the respect to be shown at Mass in only two points. This is the version in 41 points (De Ferrariis 1668b).

After Intorcetta departed Canton for Macao, Sarpetri sent him a few letters with the unexpected salutation: “Mi P.R. Procurador,” as if the Dominican Sarpetri had elected the Jesuit Intorcetta to represent him in Rome. In the first letter, Sarpetri expresses deep sadness about the decisions made by Da Gama and states that, if Da Gama does not recognize all the decisions of the Conference, this may undermine the commitment of the Dominicans. Sarpetri asserts that the majority favors Chinese Catholics wearing the hat, even when receiving Holy Communion, and that the President (Navarrete) is preparing a paper in support of the hat (Sarpetri 1668a). In the second letter to Intorcetta, Sarpetri mentions what he calls the National Conference (*Concilio nacional*) despite the absence of the Jesuits from Beijing and of the Dominicans from Fujian. Nevertheless, Sarpetri reports that Navarrete had already sent the acts of the conference to the Dominicans in Fujian, requesting only the confirmation that the Jesuits would hold to the resolutions decided during the conference until the final decision of Rome. Again, the problem of the changes introduced by Da Gama on the issue of the Chinese hat was a major concern for the Dominicans, and Sarpetri affirms his support for the Chinese hat, saying: “los chinos christianos en la Iglesia se crubram la cabeza ... es mayor reverentia” (Sarpetri 1668b). Sarpetri knew about Intorcetta’s difficulties with Da Gama in Macao, and so he wrote a third letter directly to Da Gama in support of the Chinese hat. By prohibiting Chinese Catholics to wear a hat during Mass, Da Gama was jeopardizing the agreement reached in Canton. Sarpetri mentions in this letter that on 12 November 1668 he had already written to the Propaganda Fide about this matter (Sarpetri 1668c). In a final letter to Da Gama, Sarpetri reaffirms Navarrete’s intention to uphold the conference resolutions, though Navarrete had not publicly announced it since he was awaiting confirmation from the Dominicans in Fujian (Sarpetri 1668d). As we can see, Sarpetri made great efforts to preserve the resolutions of the Canton Conference as signed on 26 January 1668, at least until Rome makes a final decision. In contrast, Navarrete’s commitment to the Canton Conference was somewhat loose. Though he signed with the Canton Jesuits the amendment

on the hat, Da Gama's persistence had convinced him that the resolutions could not be saved in their entirety.

Most notably, when the missionaries started the Canton Conference, they had agreed to set aside the contentious issue of the Chinese Rites. However, on 26 January 1668, the final day of the conference, Sarpetri unexpectedly introduced point 41 about allowing Chinese rites honoring ancestors and Confucius in agreement with the decree of the Holy Inquisition ratified by Pope Alexander VII in 1656. All the missionaries except Caballero signed the acts of the conference. Navarrete submitted himself to the majority rule concerning the Chinese Rites, but not long after the formal end of the conference, he recanted and began drafting a report in Spanish expressing his opposition to the Chinese rites. Probably he was impressed by the stance of Caballero, but an idea often surfaces in his writings: if the China mission suffers such a persecution, this is not only because of the intrinsic evilness of the Manchus, but also because the missionaries have been too tolerant of local superstitions, so that God now allows the persecution to happen. On 8 March 1668, Navarrete finished his report, which he handed over to the Jesuit Vice-Provincial Feliciano Pacheco the following day (Navarrete 1668a); Navarrete likely read aloud parts of his report to all because Brancati called it a *declamatio*.

One month later, Caballero produced another document against the Chinese Rites. Already some 30 years earlier, in 1637, Caballero had started to question the legitimacy of the Chinese Rites, and on 20 August 1661 he had penned a "Sworn declaration ... on the worship and rites of the Chinese towards their deceased ancestors" (*Declaratio ... iuxta cultum Ritusque Sinarum erga suos e vita discessos Maiores*), expressing his opposition to the Chinese Rites. In the same year he discovered the treatise in Portuguese of the Italian Jesuit Nicolò Longobardo (1565–1655) against the Chinese terms, which he had obtained in Shandong from Valat. In this treatise, Longobardo does not directly discuss the Chinese Rites, but he argues against the Chinese terms of Shangdi, *linghun* and *guishen* to express the Christian ideas of God, soul and angels. Caballero translated quite faithfully the text of Longobardo into Latin, but he was mostly concerned with the question of the Chinese Rites as we can see from his marginal notes. Caballero sent both the original Portuguese manuscript of Longobardo and his own Latin translation to the Propaganda Fide in Rome. Then, on 18 November 1662, he completed his "Report on the Sects of China" (*Relatio Sinae Sectarum*) where he stated his opposition not only to the Confucian rites but also to Confucian philosophy in general. In his report of April 1668 in Canton, Caballero expressed his opposition to some resolutions of the conference. Unlike Navarrete's *declamatio*, the document is not addressed to the Jesuit Vice-Provincial Pacheco in Canton, but to the Jesuit Visitor Da Gama in Macao. Caballero mentioned the points of the Canton Conference he disagrees with. First, he was against authorizing Chinese fasters to baptism (point n. 6; see the section below

on the fasters). He was also against Chinese Catholics wearing a hat during Mass (points n. 20 and 22; see the section below on the Chinese hat). More importantly he was against the Chinese Rites (point n. 41), and this issue occupies the greater part of his letter, with many repetitive arguments (Caballero 1668a). Caballero possessed in Canton a copy of the Portuguese text of Longobardo, and he showed it to Navarrete who copied the Portuguese text and made a Spanish translation. This copy of the Portuguese text is now preserved at the BNF (Longobardo 1668). In November, Caballero made a first addition to his report of April 1668, now addressed to the Superior General of the Jesuits. Specifically he points out that Da Costa and Intorcetta translated the word *ji* 祭 in the Chinese Classics as “to make a sacrifice,” and this shows that the ancient Chinese were practicing idolatry (Caballero 1668b). In December, he made a second addition, also addressed to the Superior General of the Jesuits. While Longobardo considered Confucianism as materialistic and atheistic, Caballero argued that it was superstitious and idolatrous. Although he did not directly criticize Confucius himself, he rejected Confucianism which he interpreted as the worship of the idol Confucius (Caballero 1668c).

On 18 April 1668, approximately one month after Navarrete’s declamation, Pacheco provided a brief answer to Navarrete, asserting that the Jesuits had never allowed Chinese Christians to offer sacrifices and prayers to Confucius; instead, they viewed the rituals to Confucius as political, and thus compatible with Christianity (Pacheco 1668). Navarrete deemed Pacheco’s answer unsatisfactory and wrote to the Visitor Da Gama on April 22 to complain about the dismissive attitude of Pacheco (Navarrete 1668a). In fact, Pacheco did not dismiss the issue raised by Navarrete since he instructed four Jesuits to prepare reports in support of the Chinese Rites. First, Intorcetta wrote a pastoral answer which he brought to Europe, but published only in 1700 at the apex of the Rites Controversy in Europe as *Testimonium de Cultu Sinensi*. Intorcetta refutes Navarrete’s 42 points with eight demonstrations. As Intorcetta states, the fourth demonstration is entirely taken from Brancati, who was then regarded as the best sinologist among the missionaries, including a description and analysis of the Jiding 祭丁 ritual to Confucius according to the *Daming huidian* 大明會典 (*Collected Statutes of the Great Ming*), as well as 17 sinological notes drawn mostly from the Chinese dictionary *Zihui* 字匯 and from the *Liji jishuo* 禮記集說 by the Yuan dynasty commentator Chen Hao 陳浩 (Intorcetta 1668a).

The theological answer was penned by Le Faure in two stages. First, he wrote in early 1669 a short answer (*Compendiaria responsio*) to the doubts of Navarrete: the rituals to Confucius and ancestors are not idolatrous and not meant to obtain supernatural felicity, but according to the *Shujing*, *Liji*, *Four Books* (*Sishu*) and *Jiali*, the rituals are political or civil (Le Faure 1669a). A few months later in 1669, Le Faure finalized a theological and historical dissertation (*Dissertatio theologica historica*),

which is structured as a systematic treatise analyzing the object of Chinese piety as *Shangdi*, *zhuzai* 主宰, *guishen*, *shen*, its practical forms with the hat, bowing, kneeling, candles, animal killing, its circumstances of place and manners, and the rituals to Confucius (Le Faure 1669c). Gabiani also wrote a report on the Chinese Rites, but he finished it after the Canton exile, in 1680, and we have not included it here. Among the four answers to Navarrete, the one by Intorcetta was the first to be completed because he was elected procurator for the mission and was to depart for Europe.

Since Navarrete had received a conciliary letter of Da Gama, dated 12 May 1668, he believed that matters could be arranged, but when he saw the theological answer by Le Faure on 21 March 1669, he could see there was a huge rift. In a letter to Da Gama, dated 17 April 1669, Navarrete rejected all the arguments of Le Faure. For him, the Chinese Rites at the beginning may have been expressions of gratitude, but they have evolved later into idolatrous and superstitious practices. Navarrete expressed doubts about the faith of the Christian literati, saying that in 83 years of mission, there may be only five or six truly devout Christians among them! He mentioned interviewing Chinese Christians in the Canton residence. For instance, the bachelor Marcos explains *fujiu* 福酒 in the ritual to Confucius as a blessed, holy and sanctified wine (*bendito*, *santo*, *santificado*), even comparing it to the wine in the chalice during the Catholic Mass. While Chinese Christians may have naturally associated the rituals to Confucius with the Catholic Mass, Navarrete argued that this association underscored the need for a clear demarcation between true worship and idolatry (Navarrete 1669a).

On 1 June 1669, Brancati completed the first draft of the sinological answer. It was published much later, in 1700, as *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta*, and with the same publisher as Intorcetta's *Testimonium*. The first part comprises 17 chapters, consisting in a close commentary and refutation of Navarrete's *declamatio*, one point after another, mostly about the Jiding ritual. The second part comprises 13 chapters, which tackle questions related to the Jiding ritual and to the spirits (Brancati 1669). On 25 June 1669, Pacheco made another attempt to persuade Navarrete. He presented Navarrete with Brancati's manuscript of 70 pages, telling him that, in view of the eternal salvation of the Chinese, the Chinese Rites should be considered purely political. Pacheco urged Navarrete to cease the controversy and to refrain from further writing on the matter. Unfortunately for Navarrete, he had just lost his most important ally, Caballero, who passed away on 13 May 1669. Despite this setback, Navarrete continued to work on a response, as long as Brancati's report. He noticed that the Jesuits had changed their translation: "offering" instead of "sacrifice" for *ji* 祭, "hall" instead of "temple" for *miao* 廟. He also criticized the Jesuits' alleged duplicity in permitting the Chinese Rites while claiming they did not endorse them (Navarrete 1669b). Navarrete did not disclose in Canton the content of his response, incorporating it later into his *Controversias*.

Even before coming to Canton, the Dominican Sarpetri was in favor of the Riccian use of Shangdi for God, in opposition to the stance of his Dominican fellows. In May 1667, before the Canton Conference, he penned a short testimonial in support of Ricci's *Tianzhu shiyi* (Sarpetri 1667). In 1668, Sarpetri wrote another pro-Jesuit testimonial during the heated debates about the Chinese Rites. Sarpetri recounted spending eight years studying the Chinese Rites and affirmed the Jesuit practice as being safe, more probable and more useful for evangelization. Against the assertions of Morales in Rome in 1646, Sarpetri testified that the Jesuits in China proclaimed a crucified man as God and did not allow any superstition, emphasizing that his declaration was made freely, not being influenced by anyone, but only by the love of truth (Sarpetri 1668e). Sarpetri entrusted the two testimonials to the Jesuits, and in November 1668 he also wrote a letter to the Propaganda Fide, which he entrusted to Intorcetta. In this letter, he reiterated his support for the Jesuit interpretation of the Chinese Rites. While he refrained from mentioning his Dominican superior, Navarrete, he rebutted Caballero's position as detrimental to the wellbeing of the mission, as breaking the uniformity among missionaries, and as scandalous to the Chinese (Sarpetri 1668f).

Surprisingly, in September 1669, Navarrete sought to find a temporary negotiation (*transactio*) or conciliation (*concordia*) until Rome made a final decision. He claimed to have found the records of a conference held in Hangzhou by the Jesuits in April 1642. Based on this alleged finding, Navarrete proposed to allow the Chinese Rites (Navarrete 1669c). The new Jesuit Vice-Provincial Gouvea could not find any trace of the document mentioned by Navarrete, but he gladly accepted the unexpected agreement proposed by Navarrete (Gouvea 1669a). Even Sarpetri could reconcile with his fellow Dominican, writing to Gouvea that he would abide to the agreement (Sarpetri 1669a). But most likely the intentions of Navarrete were not genuine. As he was preparing his secret evasion which happened at the beginning of December, he needed to keep all the missionaries off guard, and he probably forged the document of the Hangzhou conference. Unlike the admiration of James Sylvester Cummins and some sinologists today for Navarrete, Paul Rule has strongly criticized Navarrete for his lack of objectivity and for his dishonesty. When in 1680 the Jesuits in China learnt that Navarrete had published in Europe against the Chinese Rites, they felt betrayed and wrote a new batch of extensive refutations, which are beyond the period of our present research.

After Navarrete's unexpected departure from Canton, Sarpetri continued to advocate for the Chinese Rites. On 30 September 1670, he completed a Brief Notice (*Breve notitia*) which was published only in 1700 as *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta*. Concerning the Terms Controversy, he admitted that, even before coming to Canton, he had adhered to the Riccian position of Shangdi as a legitimate equivalent for God. Concerning the Rites Controversy, he acknowledged adopting several points

from the Jesuits, but not all. Sarpetri points out that the crucial point is not the form of the rituals, but their object. Rituals in the *Shujing* are addressed to ancestors, but they are not idolatrous; in the *Liji* the rituals are addressed to Shangdi, and they are legitimate. However, the ancient texts are not always clear in keeping the distinction, leading to misinterpretations among the Chinese commentators. Consequently, missionaries can only reach the probable meaning of the texts (Sarpetri 1670). According to the Dominican historian González (1964, 444–445), Sarpetri had only recopied extracts from the reports of Le Faure and Brancati, or some Jesuits may have helped him to write his report which he signed only because he was unable to write such fine Spanish. Though Sarpetri relied heavily on the Jesuit writings, nevertheless Paul Rule considers Sarpetri's arguments as showing “a discrimination and common sense all too often absent in the Apologias of the Jesuits and their opponents” (Rule 2021, 145). Canaris (2024) also shows that Sarpetri developed independent insights into the Rites Controversy, arguing for a pragmatic approach considering theological and historical knowledge, as well as the effective usage of terms by the communities in question. On such basis, Sarpetri argued for allowing Chinese Catholics to practice the Chinese Rites, while also pledging obedience to the final decision of Rome.

One of the most unexpected outcomes of the Rites Controversy was to force the missionaries to study more deeply the Confucian Classics, especially the *Book of Rites*, and their Song and Ming commentaries. They also extensively studied Chinese dictionaries to elucidate the different meanings of the Chinese characters. Navarrete was the first to translate full sections of the *Daming huidian* related to the Jiding ritual, and this inspired Brancati to translate more sections of this work. Amid the missionaries' complex argumentation of the missionaries in favor or against the Chinese Rites, there is rich sinological analysis which even today holds great significance.

4 The Debates on the Admission to Baptism of Chinese Fasters

Besides the Chinese Rites Controversy, two minor controversies erupted among the Canton missionaries, which also turned into lengthy reports sent from Canton to Europe, but which failed to create much discussion in Europe. The controversies concern the admission of fasters to baptism and the Chinese custom of covering the head during Catholic liturgy.

Missionaries in China had consistently attacked the Buddhist dietary practices as being based on the superstitious belief that abstinence from meat would help

obtaining a better reincarnation. However, some Chinese were willing to be baptized only under the condition they could keep their vegetarian diet. Point number 6 of the Canton conference addresses precisely this situation by stating: “Chinese fasters who have not broken their fast are not to be admitted to baptism, except in extraordinary circumstances in which there is no scandal and the right intention for fasting can be proven; Christians are strongly advised not to deter the fasters from listening to catechism by carelessly reproving them for their fast, but should gently take them to the priest to be taught about their obligations” (De Ferrariis 1668a).

This resolution provided missionaries with significant flexibility in interpreting what constituted “extraordinary circumstances.” Initially adopted by a majority vote among the 23 fathers, the resolution faced opposition from Valat who raised concerns about its internal coherence. In response to Valat’s objections, Brancati wrote a two-page document explaining the two layers of the resolution. He clarified that while the general rule requested that the fasters eat a piece of meat, priests retained the authority to exempt from this requirement in exceptional cases based on their judgment (Brancati 1667). Despite Brancati’s efforts to address Valat concerns, Valat continued to express his opposition to the fast which he considered as intrinsically evil. Unfortunately, the documents by Valat are lost.

Da Gama probably received Valat’s written objections about the Chinese fasting. Additionally, in April 1668, he received a letter from the Franciscan Caballero, who characterizes the fasters as idolaters (*sufragáneos a Belial*) affiliated with a widespread confraternity (*cofradía*) across China and Vietnam. According to Caballero, these people had made vows to an idol to fast, fearing punishment if they failed to fulfill their pledges. When people seeking baptism refused to eat a piece of meat as sign of their conversion, Caballero considered it as a deceit, and he argued that no priest should be allowed to relax the conditions for admission to baptism (Caballero 1668a). Further elaborating on his stance in a letter to the Jesuit Superior General in December 1668, Caballero explained that people refused to break their fast to avoid losing the merits accumulated over many years (Caballero 1668b). In the second letter to the Superior General, also in December 1668, Caballero referenced an early missionary work, the *Shengjiao yuanliu* 聖教源流 (The Origin of the Holy Teaching, 1636), which explicitly prohibited baptizing fasters unless they first break their fast (Caballero 1668c).

In addition to Caballero, another strong opponent of the Chinese fast was Grelon. Even before the conference concluded, he began preparing his initial report, questioning the ambiguity of the formulation regarding the admission of fasters to baptism. Grelon firmly believed that allowing a faster to baptism would always lead to scandal among Chinese Christians, as he saw no valid reason for a faster to refuse breaking his fast. Grelon presented four arguments: (1) Intorcetta introduced an allowance that the first missionaries in China have never authorized; (2) the Chinese

Catholics are against admitting fasters and they are scandalized if priests permit this; (3) the Chinese in general and especially the government officials are very suspicious of heterodox and rebellious sects promoting fasting; (4) the fast itself is entirely superstitious and directed towards a diabolic end (Grelon 1668a).

As Grelon composed his report against admitting the fasters, Intorcetta worked independently on his own report in favor of admitting the fasters. He acknowledged that fasting was historically introduced into China by Buddhism, but he argued that some forms of fasting had been already assimilated into Confucian culture, such as children fasting to honor their parents. Intorcetta contended that fasting could similarly be Christianized, allowing Christianity to integrate into Confucian society. Besides those cultural and social considerations, Intorcetta provided two ecclesiastical arguments for not requiring breaking the fast. First, according to the Church's rules, a general renunciation and the intention to observe the commandments of the Church are sufficient for baptism, and no specific renunciations are requested. Secondly, to request a candidate for baptism to break his fast constitutes an excessive burden, which is therefore illicit. Intorcetta further supported his stance with five confirmations: (1) the consistency of the missionary policy which does not request a special rejection of any superstition; (2) the rule that an individual is not under ecclesiastical jurisdiction before baptism; (3) the absence of scandal within Chinese society or the Church; (4) the contradiction of Grelon who considers the fast as intrinsically evil, and yet would authorize someone to continue fasting after having broken it; (5) the analogy between keeping the fast and the veneration of the tutelary deities or spirit protectors of a city (*chenghuang*) suggesting that both practices can be Christianized (Intorcetta 1668b).

On the issue of admitting the fasters, Intorcetta found strong support from the former provincial and moral theologian Le Faure who contributed a sixth confirmation as appendix to Intorcetta's report. The Jesuit missionaries since Francis Xavier (1506–1552) were careful not to offend Buddhists in India or Japan by eating meat. Similarly, Jesuits in the Madurai region of India, like Roberto de Nobili (1577–1656), abstained from eating meat to avoid offending the Brahmins. From the point of view of moral theology, Le Faure argues that no excessive burden requesting specific renunciations by word or by act should be imposed on the candidates to baptism. Le Faure concludes with two principles: (1) a missionary should not harshly pressure Chinese to break their fast before baptism; (2) if someone refuses to break his fast, Chinese Christians should refrain from discussing individual cases and defer to the judgment of the missionary. Finally, Le Faure acknowledges that the risk of a missionary being deceived by the fasters, but this risk is outweighed by the significant benefit of baptizing so many fasters who have a right intention (Le Faure 1668a). One year later, Le Faure claimed that his allowance for the fasters is based on his

own personal investigation on the matter: out of one thousand Chinese fasters he did not find anyone who believed in transmigration (Le Faure 1669c), though this seems hardly believable, or at least an exaggeration.

Only after having completed his first report on 10 January 1668 did Intorcetta read the content of Grelon's first report and append a two-page response titled: "What to Do When Chinese Fasters Refuse Breaking Their Fast before Baptism?" Intorcetta expressed disappointment that Grelon had discarded the common agreement voted during the conference and was now arguing that the Chinese fasting was intrinsically evil, and the fasters were corrupted by malice. Intorcetta proceeded to refute Grelon's four arguments succinctly: (1) Grelon is incorrect in saying that ancient missionaries requested the breaking of the fast before baptism, citing the words and writings of Semedo and Vagnone; (2) Grelon is incorrect in saying that Chinese Catholics are scandalized when fasters are admitted to baptism as the writings of Vagnone show; (3) Grelon is incorrect in saying that Chinese in general are against fasting and that the fasters are suspected of rebellion; (4) Grelon is wrong as regarding the fast as completely superstitious and directed towards a diabolic end because religious people can legitimately renounce eating meat for God (Intorcetta 1668c).

In response to Intorcetta, Grelon provided his own answer (*Responsio*). First, he rejects the accusation by Intorcetta that he had departed from the majority agreement because 13 out of the 23 priests in the Conference voted against Chinese fasters being admitted to baptism unless they break their fast. Like Valat, Grelon does not recognize the second part of the resolution which allows for exceptional cases left to the judgment of the priest, and he suggests that Intorcetta is imposing an interpretation of the resolution which goes against the majority. Then, Grelon denied having said that the fast itself is intrinsically evil, but professing superstition through fasting is indeed intrinsically evil. He cited the testimonies of elderly Jesuits in Canton like Gouvea, Canevari, Pacheco, Jorge, Gabiani, Valat, and Augery, who affirmed that they have never baptized fasters unless they first broke their fast. There were rumors that Brancati and Intorcetta had baptized fasters but they did not dare to confirm it openly. Concerning historical precedents, Grelon confirms that Semedo had baptized three sailors who were fasting, but the Vice-Provincial reprimanded him for it. Similarly, Vagnone did allow fasters to keep fasting after baptism, but he required them to break the fast at least once before baptism. On the social and political implications of fasting in China, Grelon admitted that Buddhist monks faced no repercussions for their fast, but all the officials and common people who are fasting may be suspected of rebellion. Grelon argued that people in Beijing and Shandong who were persecuted due to their Buddhist fast had sought the protection of the Church by asking for baptism (Grelon 1668b).

The Canton Conference marks a significant milestone for the Jesuit, Dominican and Franciscan congregations in standardizing their missionary practices. About the admission of fasters to baptism, the practice was far from being uniform as we can see in the examples brought by Grelon and Intorcetta. But the fragmentary evidence of the past was inconclusive, and the question of the Chinese fasters turned to be the proper way for Christianity to be inserted in a non-Christian society. Grelon's stance is not just informed by a Christian or European worldview but also by the local Chinese context. For him, fasting was a social and superstitious practice linked to Buddhism and heterodox sects, and he believed that Christianity should reject this kind of fasting to ensure that converts integrate better into the mainstream of Chinese society. In contrast, Intorcetta strives to reach out to people who practice Buddhism or popular religions, especially those practicing the fast. Instead of advocating a complete rejection of their former practices, Intorcetta is ready to Christianize some of them, and he sees the fast as an important practice across the Chinese society that should be respected and even embraced by Chinese Christianity for a better insertion in Chinese culture and society.

5 The Debates Whether Chinese Should Wear a Hat during Mass

On 25 June 1615, Pope Paul V (r. 1605–1621) issued the brief *Romanae Sedis Antistes* authorizing priests in China to wear a hat during the holy services, later referred to as *jijin* 祭巾 in Chinese (Bontinck 1962). Approximately 50 years later, during the Canton conference, the question of the hat was extended to the faithful: should they wear a hat during Mass? As mentioned above, two different versions of the Practical Norms are found in the Roman Jesuit Archives, one in 41 points and another in 42 points, and the difference precisely concerns the issue of wearing the hat or not during Mass (Meynard and Yang 2021). In the 42-points version authenticated by Da Gama, Numbers 20 and 22 deal with the hat:

20. If the one serving the priest at the altar wears the surplice, he should serve with his head uncovered; but with the hat if he does not wear the surplice.
21. In the ministry of Mass, the use of surplice should not be abolished.
22. When neophytes receive communion, they should uncover their head. But when they attend Mass, they should wear a hat. But if someone out of poverty doesn't have a hat, he should not be reproved because of this (De Ferrariis 1668a).

Number 20 allows the altar servant to wear a hat under the condition that he does not wear at the same time the surplice, but Number 21 somehow cancels out the allowance of the hat since the altar servant should preferably wear the surplice. In his report dated to 9 April 1668, Caballero offers an explanation for this apparent contradiction. Initially, the missionaries had passed the resolution Number 20, but shortly later (at least before the end of the conference on 26 January 1668), they discovered that one of the previous Jesuit Visitors had decreed that lay people serving at the altar should always wear a surplice, leading to the addition of Number 21. While Number 20 aimed to allow altar servants to wear a hat as a form of inculturation (but without wearing the surplice), Number 21 was now enforcing that altar servants should wear the surplice, thus their head automatically being uncovered. Number 22 also contains an internal inconsistency since it mandates Chinese Catholics to wear a hat during Mass as a sign of respect, except during the reception of the Holy Communion, when they should remove the hat to show respect. In other words, respect is indicated both by wearing and removing the hat. Those regulations reflect a state of instability between two factions: a majority supporting Chinese Catholics wearing a hat during Mass, and a significative push from a minority to forbid wearing the hat during the reception of the Holy Communion. In fact, the contradictions between Numbers 20, 21, and 22 were not due to the missionaries, who could hardly have made such a gross mistake.

As secretary of the Conference, De Ferrariis had prepared the final draft of the Practical Norms and sent them to Macao in Spring of 1668. However, he later discovered that Da Gama in Macao had made changes in Numbers 20 and 22. In reaction to Da Gama's alterations, the majority of missionaries in Canton agreed now that the Chinese Christians, the priests celebrating Mass, and the altar servants were all to wear a hat during the whole Mass. De Ferrariis then revised the Practical Norms, reducing them to 41 regulations: the previous Number 20 was entirely removed; the content of Number 21 was retained and became Number 20; Number 22 was replaced with the correction mentioned above and became Number 21 (De Ferrariis 1668b). De Ferrariis prepared also a one-single-sheet document stating the changes for Numbers 20 and 22 with the original signatures of 15 priests, among whom 13 Jesuits: the Vice-Provincial Feliciano Pacheco, the superior of the residence, Gouvea, as well as another Portuguese, Torrente, four Italians, De Ferrariis, Canevari, Gabiani, and Brancati, three French, Claude Motel, Jacques Motel, and Le Faure, the Austrian Herdrich, and two Flemish Couplet and Rougemont. Five Jesuits opposed to wearing the Chinese hat did not sign: Grelon who wrote the treatise against the hat, two other French Jesuits, Valat and Augery, the Italian Lubelli, and the Portuguese Jorge. On the side of the Dominicans, Navarrete quite surprisingly

signed the correction (he was firmly against the rituals to Confucius and to the ancestors), as well as Sarpetri, but not Leonardo. Caballero also did not sign the document (De Ferrariis 1668c).

Not only did De Ferrariis serve as secretary, but he also personally engaged with the issue, producing a very detailed treatise accompanying the corrective document of 10 October 1668. His treatise is made of three parts. In the first part, De Ferrariis argued for the need of adapting to local culture, emphasizing that in China, wearing a hat is the paramount sign of respect. He notes that even the Manchus have gradually adopted and adhered to this practice. De Ferrariis highlights the shift in liturgical practices following the Brief of Paul V, which led to public liturgies where both priests and faithful wore hats, contrasting with the previous discrete approach where the faithful were requested to uncover head at Mass. The second part of De Ferrariis's treatise delves into five reasons behind the controversy, rooted in divergent personal views that have emerged over time: (1) the "nationalistic feeling" among newly arrived missionaries; (2) a zeal to impose European culture on the Chinese; (3) a hasty judgment by Adam Schall who thought that the Manchus had abolished the customs of the hat; (4) a failure of the Chinese Vice-Province to adequately train new missionaries in Chinese culture; (5) the reluctance of the faithful, particularly in rural and impoverished areas, to reject changes imposed by the priests. In the third part, De Ferrariis advocates for maintaining the ancient practice of wearing the hat. First, the ethnocentric feelings of the missionaries should be abandoned for the sake of the salvation of all. Second, Catholic liturgy allows flexibility, and it is not true that each rubric should be universally followed. Additionally, there is a notable anti-Manchu sentiment in the treatise, with De Ferrariis suggesting that the responsibility for the persecution falls upon Schall who became too close to the Manchus, giving an opportunity for the opponents to attack Christianity (De Ferrariis 1668d).

Da Gama received from Canton the corrective document about Numbers 20 and 22 with the 15 signatures, as well as the treatise of De Ferrariis in favor of the Chinese hat. On 10 December 1668, he authenticated the original documents and the copies to be sent to Rome. However, concerning the resolutions of the Conference, Da Gama sent to Rome the 42-points version and not the 41-points version which truly represents the majority view. Quite understandably, the Jesuits in Canton had already lost confidence in Da Gama, and already in October 1668, Ferrariis had sent directly to the Superior General the correction about Numbers 20 and 22 as well as the new version in 41-points. Ferrariis complained about Da Gama making unilateral changes on the decisions of the Canton Conference.

Without waiting the final decision of Rome, Da Gama made a very bold move in October 1668, mandating that all the priests in the Canton residence conduct Mass and recite the Litanies without wearing their hat (De Ferrariis 1668e). Initially, most

Jesuits refused to obey, but they were eventually compelled to comply. However, the Dominicans Navarrete and Sarpetri persisted in wearing their hat, leading to a noticeable discrepancy in the liturgy's appearance, which was described as ugliness (*difformitas*).

Ferrariis sent a second letter of complaint to the Superior General regarding Da Gama's actions. Indeed, Da Gama had ordered Intorcetta to remain silent in Macao while waiting for the boat to Europe. Da Gama refused to discuss with Intorcetta though he was elected as procurator of the Vice-Province (De Ferrariis 1668f). At the end of December, Ferrariis sent a third letter warning the Superior General that Da Gama may be attempting to modify the documents of the Vice-Province sent through him to Rome (De Ferrariis 1668g).

Concerning the imposition of the Chinese hat in Canton, many were shocked by the way Da Gama ordered the superior of the residence, Gouvea, to read aloud the instruction in front of the Vice-Provincial Pacheco and all the other priests. Le Faure directly wrote to Da Gama to express his opposition to the decision, outlining six reasons not to obey (Le Faure 1668b), and arguing for the importance of the hat in Chinese culture (Le Faure 1669b). Similarly, Canevari penned a letter to the Superior General urging him to restore the authority of Pacheco (Canevari 1668). Around the same time, Rougemont sent a letter of complaint to the Superior General about Da Gama's handling of the Chinese hat, "about which he has no practice or expertise" (Rougemont 1668b). They all mentioned that Da Gama's ban of the Chinese hat jeopardized all the resolutions of the Canton Conference.

The only one who had consistently refused to accept the resolutions and declined to sign the acts of Conference was the Franciscan Caballero. His dissent stemmed from his opposition to the Chinese hat (Numbers 20 and 22), to the Chinese fast (Number 6), and to the Chinese Rites (Number 41). Caballero articulated his stance through three lengthy and repetitive reports, the first addressed to Da Gama, and the subsequent two addressed to the Jesuit Superior General. In his initial report to Da Gama, finalized on 9 April 1668, Caballero elaborated on his opposition to the Chinese hat. He emphasized that in Chinese culture, respect is not exclusively demonstrated by wearing a hat, contending that the Chinese can understand and accept that Catholics pay respect to God by having their head uncovered (Caballero 1668a).

It seems that Caballero harbored doubts about whether Da Gama would transmit his treatise to the Superior General. Consequently, on 14 November 1668, he opted to communicate directly with Giovanni Paolo Oliva, providing additional information. Caballero observed that in Beijing, altar servants were not wearing the hat. Additionally, he reported what Intorcetta had told him in Canton: upon his arrival at Jianchang 建昌 in Jiangxi, some Catholics wore the hat and others did not; Intorcetta asked them to determine the best uniform practice, and the faithful opted for attending Mass with head uncovered and they have kept this practice since then.

Caballero also stated that Da Gama and all the Jesuit Visitors before him have always considered better that Chinese Catholics receive Holy Communion with head uncovered. He expressed concerns that Intorcetta and other Jesuits were now attempting to have all Chinese Catholics with head covered while receiving communion. Caballero here refers to the 41-points version, which indeed makes such imposition. Concerning the hat of the priest, Caballero noticed that Intorcetta is one of the most attached to it. He informs the Superior General that Da Gama had ordered in November 1668 that all the Jesuits in Canton should uncover their head at Mass and while reciting the Litanies. Despite the protests of the majority of the Jesuits who wrote three or four times to Da Gama, the Visitor had enforced compliance. Caballero disclosed that since 1633, he himself had abstained from wearing the hat and had urged Chinese Christians to adopt European customs by forgoing the hat either. He emphasized that despite his prohibition of the hat, Christian communities in his area continued to thrive (Caballero 1668b).

In December 1668, Caballero penned another letter to the Jesuit Superior General. He observed a generational divide regarding the Chinese hat, noting that the young generation of missionaries who had arrived in China after 1658 advocated for its use, even during the reception of Holy Communion; in contrast, he remarked that veteran missionaries like Schall did not uphold this (Caballero 1668c).

The debate over the hat became increasingly polarized, with the majority of the missionaries in Canton requesting that Chinese faithful wear the hat at Mass all the time, including when receiving communion. In contrast, Caballero was pushing for the hat to be completely abolished, not only for Chinese Catholics, but even for the priests. Caballero likely found satisfaction in seeing Da Gama leaning towards his position, as Da Gama began to require Chinese Catholics to receive Holy Communion with head uncovered and even compelled the Jesuits in Canton to take off their hat during liturgies. To many Jesuits, Caballero and Da Gama's moves were perceived as a direct threat to the very existence of the Chinese hat of the priest.

With Valat, Grelon brought the issue of the hat to Da Gama's attention following the Canton Conference and he successfully convinced him to change the wording of articles 20 and 22. Subsequently, upon reading De Ferrariis' report in favor of the hat, Da Gama requested Grelon to write a report advocating the opposite stance. Therefore, Grelon stands out as the only Jesuit who independently authored a full treatise against the hat. His treatise is titled "Whether It Is Correct and Expedient that Chinese Christians Attend Mass and Serve the Officiating Priest with Their Head Uncovered?" For Grelon, cultural practices may evolve over time, but the Church's liturgical norms remain constant, grounded on Biblical injunctions such as the Letter of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (11:14), which specifically prohibits men from praying with covered heads. Grelon contends that the liturgical forms of respect towards God in the Church supersede other considerations. Grelon ends with a

corollary (*corollarium*) explaining that the missionaries who defend the hat for the faithful are essentially defending the papal authorization of the *jijin* for the priest, although he stops short of advocating the revocation of the papal authorization (Grelon 1668c).

Grelon wrote also an “Appendix to the Treatise on the Chinese Using or not the Hat in the Church,” almost as long as the treatise itself. Grelon expands upon the theme of the constancy of the Catholic rituals against the ever-changing social etiquette. He provides a vivid anecdote observed from the window of the Jesuit residence in Canton: a neighbor had welcomed Buddhist monks in front of his house, made some offerings, and touched the ground with his head while the monks were singing prayers; then, the neighbor and all the people around removed their hat. Grelon mentions that all the missionaries saw this, suggesting that removing the hat is also a sign of respect (Grelon 1668d).

At the end of September 1688, Sarpetri wrote to Intorcetta, who was now in Macao, a first letter, informing him that the majority of the missionaries had voted in favor of Chinese wearing the hat even for the Holy Communion, and that Navarrete was preparing a report in favor of the hat (Sarpetri 1668a). In another letter in November 1668, Sarpetri urged Intorcetta to confirm the decisions of the Canton conference, stressing the necessity of maintaining the use of the hat to salvage the decisions of the entire Canton Conference (Sarpetri 1668b), as we have mentioned above.

In the midst of the opposition to the Chinese hat among certain Jesuits, the Dominican Leonardo found encouragement to voice his own dissent, despite the position of Navarrete and Sarpetri in favor of the hat. In September 1668, Leonardo finalized a treatise against the Chinese hat, which was co-signed by Caballero, Grelon, and four other Jesuits, Lubelli, Jorge, Augery and Valat, arguing for the permanence and universality of the laws of the Church compared to the diverse and ever-changing social etiquette (Leonardo 1668b).

In October 1668, Navarrete sent his own report to Da Gama entitled “Whether It Is Convenient in China that Christians Attend Mass with the Head Covered?” In his *Controversias* (1679), Navarrete mostly reproduces the content of his report of 1668. Like in many of his other writings, the composition is not well structured and full of repetitions. As we have seen, Navarrete is strongly opposed to Chinese Catholics practicing the rituals to Confucius and to ancestors and he is also opposed to the baptism of fasters, but on the question of the hat, he accepts the Chinese custom of wearing the hat. In his report, he cites articles 20, 21 and 22 from the 42-points version of the *Practical Norms* approved by Da Gama according to which Chinese Catholics should wear the hat during Mass except when they receive communion. In fact, he supports the 41-points version which prescribes wearing the hat at Mass, even during communion, according to the correction that both Navarrete and Sarpetri had

signed, as discussed above. Navarrete recounts that he himself saw the Chinese practice of wearing a hat being observed in provinces as well as in the capital, and that, since the Jesuits had received from Paul V the permission to wear a hat during Mass, the Dominicans in China have always adopted the policy of having the priest and all the Chinese Catholics wearing a hat during the religious services (except confession). Navarrete justifies this policy by referencing Church fathers like Saint Augustine and other theologians. Without mentioning the name of Caballero, Navarrete rejects the argument that the hat of the Catholics is like the hat used during popular plays. For him, this similarity does not call for changing the shape of the hat, even less for discarding the hat altogether (Navarrete 1668b). But for Navarrete, the most important issue was certainly the rituals to Confucius and to ancestors, and Da Gama's prohibition of the Chinese hat gave him a good excuse to withdraw altogether from the agreement of the Canton Conference.

Intorcetta had been involved in early discussions regarding the hat, but since he left Canton in August 1668, he was not involved in the subsequent debates between Caballero and Grelon on one side, and Sarpetri, Navarrete, Rougemont and Le Faure on the other side. In January 1669, Intorcetta left Macao for Europe with a set of documents of the Canton Conference. He arrived in Rome at the end of 1670, and on 15 April 1671 he wrote a formal answer to Grelon's Appendix since the others in Canton could not do so. Like Caballero, Grelon had mentioned in the Appendix that Intorcetta in Jiangxi had agreed to Christians attending Mass without hat. Intorcetta confirms that he had indeed sought uniformity of practice and proposed to adopt the European practice of attending Mass with head uncovered. Ultimately, the majority of the faithful chose to attend Mass with head uncovered as a sign of repentance for their sins towards God. However, some kept coming with the hat, and Intorcetta chose not to enforce a strict rule in this regard. He acknowledges the accuracy of the Jianchang experiment mentioned by Grelon, but cautions against drawing broad conclusions from this single case, emphasizing its uniqueness (Intorcetta 1671).

In conclusion, the Canton Conference stands at a pivotal moment in the standardization of liturgical practices among missionaries in China. While the majority of the missionaries in Canton advocated for the continuous use of the hat throughout the entire Mass, a dissenting faction led by the Franciscan Caballero, the Dominican Leonardo and a group of 5 Jesuits (Grelon, Lubelli, Jorge, Augery and Valat), supported by Da Gama in Macao, sought to eliminate completely the hat not only for the faithful but also for the priests. The stakes were very high since the outcome would affect the liturgical practice of all the Christian communities across China. Ultimately, thanks to Intorcetta's visit to Rome, the authorization to attend Mass with the hat, both for the priests and the faithful, was confirmed on 30 July 1673. The decision had a lasting impact, with the practice

of wearing the hat persisting well into the nineteenth century. However, it abruptly disappeared when Western liturgical practices were uniformly applied (Yang 2021).

6 Conclusions

The debates held in Canton in 1668 and 1669 on the Chinese Rites, fast and hat had profound but often overlooked consequences. Concerning the Chinese Rites, the missionaries developed their arguments in a more systematic way and with deeper foundations on the Chinese Classics, dictionaries and legal codes. In the apex of the Rites Controversies in Europe in 1700, the Canton treatises of Caballero, Brancati, Intorcetta, and Le Faure were all published for the first time, and their content was used again and again for new treatises about the Chinese Rites. The prohibition of the Chinese Rites by the papacy at the beginning of the eighteenth century represented a significant obstacle to the inculturation of Christianity which was then declared as heterodox by Kangxi. In this context marked by irreconcilable positions on the Chinese rites, the bold advances made in Canton to integrate the Buddhist fast within the Catholic practice could not succeed. The only positive result was the authorization by Rome of the Chinese hat for liturgy, which became a general practice for two hundred years. Overall, this process of alienation and marginalization from mainstream culture and polity shaped the identity of Chinese Christianity and forced it to create its own path within local culture and society.

The policy of accommodation, officially adopted by Propaganda Fide from 1622 onwards, was generally accepted by missionaries, albeit with varying interpretations. Concerning the three controversies, we can see that most missionaries adopted a consistent stance in favor of the Chinese rites, of the Chinese fast and of the Chinese hat. The Franciscan Caballero was also quite consistent since he opposed the three adaptations. While the Dominican Navarrete opposed the Chinese rites, he was in favor of the Chinese hat. Grelon like all the other Jesuits endorsed the Chinese rites, but he strongly opposed the Chinese hat and fast. His opposition to the Chinese fast was partly grounded in concerns about respecting Chinese culture and society. These complexities highlight the need to avoid simplistic classifications when analyzing missionaries' attitudes towards inculturation. While there may have been general trends or preferences, individual missionaries often had nuanced and multifaceted perspectives shaped by various factors, including theological considerations, cultural sensitivity, and practical realities on the ground.

References

Primary Sources

- Brancati. 1669. *Responsio apologetica de Sinensium ritibus politicis ad R. P. Dominicum Navarrete ordinis Praedicatorum*; ms. BVE Fondo Gesuitico 1250/5: ff. 349r–494v, with Chinese characters, dated 1 June 1669; Ajuda, ms. 44-XII-40: ff. 1–160 (with Chinese characters) dated 4 September 1669; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 478r–484v & 613v–637v (without Chinese characters); BNF, ms. Bréquigny 20: ff. 1–153, dated 4 September 1669; Brancati varia, Archives jésuites de Vanves, ms. GBrotier 94: ff. 54r–61v; Advertentias al pretendido Concierto de los PP. Domingo Navarrete, O. P. y Antonio de Govea, S.J., Archivo del Convento di S. Domenico, Manila, t. 56, f. 475. Manuscript of an Italian translation based on the printed Latin book of 1700: BVE, ms. Fondo Gesuitico 1299: ff. 1r–89v. See Emilio Bottazzi, “Francesco Brancati e la questione dei riti cinesi,” in Alcide Luini, ed., *Scienziati siciliani gesuiti in Cina nel secolo XVII* (Atti del convegno, Istituto Italo Cinese, Palermo, 29 ottobre 1983), Roma: Istituto Italo Cinese, 1985, 59–70. Publication: *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta. seu R. P. Francisci Brancati, Societatis Jesu, apud Sinas per annos 34. Missionarii, responsio apologetica ad R. P. Dominicum Navarrete ordinis praedicatorum*, Paris: Nicolas Pépie, 1700. The Dominican Leonardo prepared a copy of the work of Brancati, and finished it on 22 July 1671; see IRFA, AMEP Chine 426 (1669–1687): f. 122.
- Brancati. 1667. *De perpetuo jeunio idololatrarum sinensium*; ARSI, ms. Fondo Gesuitico 722/5: ff. 21r–22v.
- Caballero. 1668a. *Tratado que se remitió al mui R[everen]do P[adr]e Luis de Gama de la Comp[añ]ia de Jesús, Visitador de la Provincias de Japón y China de la misma Compañia, sobre alguns puntos tocantes a esta misión de la gran China*, signed and dated 9 April 1668, Canton, with original signature and seal, including quotes in Chinese characters: APF, SRC Indie Orientali e Cina, vol 1: ff. 272r–299r; *Tratado sobre algunos puntos tocantes a esta mission de la gran China, remittido desde esta çiu^d de Canton al mui R.^{do} P.^e Luis de Gama de la Comp.^a de Jesus*, 8 October 1668,” APF: SOCP, vol.12, 1677, ff. 165v–170r; copy by a different hand, with quotes in Chinese characters, dated 9 April 1668: BNF Espagnol 409: ff. 63–81; copy without some details and without Chinese characters: Sentir do Padre Fr. Santa Maria ao Padre Vizitador Luis da Gama sobre alguns pontos que se rezolveo na consulta, Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 28r–72v; other copy addressed to Pacheco: Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 238v–258v & 582v–607r; French translation from Spanish into French by Louis-Armand Champion de Cicé, MEP: *Traité sur quelques points importants de la Mission de la Chine*, Paris: Nicolas Pépie, 1701, 1–109.
- Caballero. 1668b. Letter to Jesuit Superior General, 14 November 1668, in ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162: ff. 231r–234v, autograph with signature and seal of Caballero. Transcription: *Sinica Franciscana*, vol. 9 part 2, 1019–30.
- Caballero. 1668c. Letter to Jesuit Superior General, 9 December 1668, with signature and seal; APF, SRC Indie Orientali e Cina, vol 1: ff. 273r–312v; copy without some details and Chinese characters: “Addición al Tratado original que compuso a R.P. Fr. Antonio de Santa Maria,” 22 March 1669; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 607r–613v. French translation from Spanish into French by Louis-Armand Champion de Cicé, MEP: *Traité sur quelques points importants de la Mission de la Chine*, 110–52.
- Canevari. 1668. Letter to Jesuit Superior General (1a via), 22 November 1668, ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162: ff. 235r–236v. Authenticated on 10 December 1668 but without the signature of Da Gama.
- Da Gama. 1668. Letter in Portuguese to Jesuit Superior General, Macao, 10 December 1668, ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162:239r–242v (5a via).
- De Ferrariis. 1668a. *Praxes quaedam discussae in pleno coetu 23 Patrum*. ARSI has three documents in 42 points: ms. Jap.Sin.158: 1r–6v (1a via) Jap.Sin.162: 259r–261v (3a via), and ms. Fondo Gesuitico 724/3: ff. 1a–4r (2a via) and note by Da Gama: “original de 42 pontos,” authenticated on 10 December 1668;

- Ajuda ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 259r–243v. The three documents have the names of the 23 participants at the end.
- De Ferrariis. 1668b. *Praxes quaedam*. ARSI has two copies: ms. Jap.Sin.162: ff. 253r–255r, with the names of the 23 participants; ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 16r–19v, without the list of participants; and ms. Fondo Gesuitico 722/12: ff. 1r–4v, without the list of participants; Copy made in Macao (18th century): Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 157r–158v, but only points 1 to 9, and then the correction on the hat with signatures; Jap.Sin.158: 24r (original signatures) and Jap.Sin.162: f. 262r (copy). Other copies (not consulted): APF, Informationi Liber 118: Pro missione sinensi, ff. 38r–41r; BAV, Borgia Latino 523, ff. 149–151; Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid, coll. Jesuitas, Legajos, 271, n. 64. Published version of the 41-points version: “Historia et disquisitio critica de coetu Cantoniensi a Jesuitis, Dominicanis ac Franciscanis in Urbe Kuam Chiam Fu pro christiana fide captivis celebrato a. 1667 & 1668,” in *Monumenta Sinica*, 1700, 186–389.
- De Ferrariis. 1668c. *Acta: Numeri 20 et 22 sic debent emendari*, with original signatures; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.158: f. 5r, with the original signatures of fifteen priests [before 6 October 1668], and the authentication of Da Gama dated 10 December 1668. BVE, ms. Fondo Gesuitico 1257/18: f. 163r. Printed in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, 45–46, with sixteen names.
- De Ferrariis. 1668d. *Apud Sinas in signum reverentiae tegendum esse caput* (Covering the Head as Sign of Respect in China), 10 October 1668; in 24 points; signed by Pacheco as Vice-Provincial and Ferrariis as socius; authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 38r–41v (1a via); copies ff. 42r–45v (3a via); ff. 46r–49v (signed by Pacheco with seal); ms. Jap.Sin.158: ff. 10r–17v (2a via) and ff. 18r–24v (5a via); Ferrariis, De Sinarum externa veneratione; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150, ff. 12r–15v; BVE, ms. Fondo Gesuitico 1257/18: ff. 149r–154v, 163 (6a via); Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62, ff. 88r–95v. Complete English translation and Latin transcription: Thierry Meynard and Yang Hongfan, “To Wear or Not to Wear a Hat during Mass? The Canton Conference and Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis’s Report of 1668,” in *AHSI* 179.I (2021): 5–61; download: <https://arsi.jesuits.global/en/publications/journal-ahsi/recent-articles-open-access/>.
- De Ferrariis. 1668e. Letter in Italian to Jesuit Superior General, 6 October 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162: ff. 211r–212v (2a via); ff. 213r–214v (1a via). Quoted in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, pp. 44–45. Transcribed by Daniel Canaris; translated into Chinese by Zhang Rui 張銳, annotated by Thierry Meynard: 《李方西致耶穌會總會長喬瓦尼·保羅·奧利瓦的意文信函（1668年10月6日）》《西學東漸研究》，第10輯，北京：商務印書館，2021年，第368–375頁。
- De Ferrariis. 1668f. Letter in Italian to Jesuit Superior General, 8 November 1668; controversies with Navarrete; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162: 227r–229v.
- De Ferrariis. 1668g. Letter in Italian to Jesuit Superior General Oliva, 29 December 1668; ARSI, Jap.Sin.162: ff. 251r–252v (1a via).
- Gouvea. 1669a. Letter Answering to Navarrete, 3 October 1669; Original Portuguese: *Reposta do P. Antonio de Govea Vice-Provincial da China dada à nome da Vice-Provincia a dos papeis do R.P. Presidente*, ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162: ff. 293v–294r. Portuguese copy Ajuda, Ajuda, ms. 44-XII-40: ff. 163–164 & ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 414v–416r. IRFA, AMEP, Chine 426 (1669–1687), ff. 121–122. Latin translation published in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, pp. 75–76, and in *Apologia pro decreto*, Louvain, 1700, pp. 80–83. French translation published in: Le Gobien, *Histoire de l’édit*, 1698, 278–88.
- Grelon. 1668a. *Utrum jejunantes Sinici volentes ad fidem converti obligandi sint ad solvendum jejunium eique renuntiandum antequam baptismum suscipiant? nec ne?*, ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.158: ff. 51r–61v; written after 26 January 1668 (mention of Saint Joseph, who was chosen on the last day of the Conference as protector of the China mission), probably around February – March 1668, authenticated by Visitor Luis da Gama on 10 December 1668. Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 95v–113v; copy: ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 262r–285v. Modern Latin transcription, *AHSI* 173 (2018-I): 117–145. Portuguese translation: Ajuda,

- ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 243v–248r. English translation by Thierry Meynard and Daniel Canaris: Whether Chinese fasters who want to convert to Christianity are obliged to break and renounce the fast before baptism?, *AHSI* 173 (2018-I): 75–116. http://www.sjweb.info/ARSI/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/2-AHSI-2018_I_-Meynard-173.pdf.
- Grelon. 1668b. *Responsio ad quaesitum et ad obiectiones P. Prosperi Intorcettae*; ARSI, Jap.Sin.158, ff. 63r–68v; Fondo Gesuitico 722/5: 32r–37v (2a via); 38r–43r (3a via); Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 285v–294r; authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668; Portuguese translation: Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 248r–249v.
- Grelon. 1668c. *An deceat et expediat Christianos Sinas aperto capite Sacro interesse et Sacerdoti sacris operanti ministrare* (Whether It Is Correct and Expedient that Chinese Christians Attend Mass and Serve the Officiating Priest with Their Head Uncovered), 1668, authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.158: 25–28v (1a via), 29r–32v (2a via) and 33–36v (5a via); BVE, Fondo Gesuitico ms. 1257/18, ff. 155r–161v (6a via); Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 249v–254v.
- Grelon. 1668d. *Appendix dissertationis de pileo sinico in templo a Christianis gestando vel non gestando* (Appendix to the Treatise on the Chinese Using or Not the Hat in the Church), written between 10 October and 10 December 1668, authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.158: ff. 37r–40v (5a via), 41r–43v (1a via), and 45r–47v (2a via); BVE, ms. Fondo Gesuitico 1257/18: ff. 159r–161v (6a via); Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 254v–258r.
- Intorcetta. 1671. *Responsio ad “Appendicem Patris Adriani Grelon de Pileo Sinico à Christianis sinensibus gestando vel non gestando in Templis.”* Rome, 15 April 1671; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 92–95v.
- Intorcetta. 1668a. *Apologetica disputatio de Officiis et Ritibus, quibus Sinenses memoriam recolunt Confucii Magistri Sui, et progenitorum suorum vita functorum*, 4 August 1668; BNF, Espagnol 409: ff. 193r–209v, 214r–242v (with Chinese characters): “Pars responsionis ad manuscriptum R.P. F. Dominici de Navarrete ex Sacra D. Dominici Familia Sacerdotis, quod, jubentibus per litteras superioribus suis, scripsit, deditque Patribus Societatis Iesu 8. Martii 1668, quo tempore in urbe Quam Cheu Metropoli Prov. Quam tum exules propter fidem degebamus tres & viginti Sacerdotes.” The BNF document is an original document made in Canton, checked by 6 Jesuit theologians and approved by Pacheco on 15 August 1668 with his seal (f. 192). This manuscript served as basis for the printed text, but without the Chinese characters. BVE, Fondo Gesuitico 1249/10, ff. 637r–690v, also with Chinese characters and the approval of Pacheco (f. 638r). Publication: *Testimonium de Cultu Sinensi, 1668*. Paris: Pépie, 1700, 318 pages.
- Intorcetta. 1668b. *Quaeritur an jejunantes in Sinis ante quam baptizentur semper et ex natura sua cogi debeant a missionariis ad fragendum suum jejunium* [It Is Asked Whether Chinese Fasters Should Always Be Forced by the Missionaries to Break Their Fast before Receiving Baptism], 10 January 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150, ff. 70r–77v (1a via), ms. Jap.Sin.150, ff. 83–90v (3a via); Fondo Gesuitico 722/5, ff. 15r–20v, and 23r–31v with Chinese characters; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 297v–317r & 317r–328v; authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668. English translation by Thierry Meynard: “It is asked whether Chinese fasters should always be forced by the missionaries to break their fast before receiving baptism because of its nature and despite the fact that they detest Idols and all superstitions, including the fasts previously observed out of superstition, and they make the formal and firm promise that they shall fast from now on for the love and veneration of God and in penance for their sins; or whether they ought to be baptized without breaking the fast if they can give a just reason for not breaking the fast,” *AHSI* 176 (2019-II): 295–319. https://arsj.jesuits.global/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/AHSI-2019.II_1-Meynard.pdf.
- Intorcetta. 1668c. *Quid agendum cum jejunantibus in Sinis, si ante baptismum difficulter inducantur ad violandum suum jejunium*, 2 pages; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 70r–v; ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 82r–v; ms.

- Fondo Gesuitico 722/5: ff. 14r–v (2a via); Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 294r–297v; authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668.
- Le Faure. 1669a. *Compendiaria responsio ad dubitationes a R.P. Fr. Dominico Navarrete propositas seu Brevis synopsis de cultu sinico Confucii ac mortuorum*, dated 21 March 1669; Archives jésuites de Vanves, ms. GBro 104: 25r–37v, followed by Excerpta ex responsione P. Prosperi Intorcetae ad P. Navarrete, ff. 39r–72v; British Library, Add. Mss. 16933. Publication in abbreviated form in Navarrete, *Controversias*, 340–43. Publication in full in Le Faure, *Dissertatio theologico-historica*, 1–21.
- Le Faure. 1669b. *Caput discopertum non est reverentia apud Sinas, ex sententia P. Jacobi Le Faure*; Jap.Sin.150: 56r–56v; part of *De sinensium ritibus* (On Chinese Rites) completed in July 1669, and approved by Gouvea on 4 March 1670. Printed text: *De sinensium ritibus*, 1700, Chapter 3, Number 1: 193–201.
- Le Faure. 1669c. *Epilogus seu praxis ad R.P. Fr. Dominicum de Navarrete*; ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 724/3: ff. 1r–18v; *Dissertatio theologico-historica de avita Sinorum pietate erga defunctos et eximia erga Confusium magistrum suum observantia*, Prolegomena ad R.P. Fr. Dominicum Navarrete, June 1669, checked by 6 Jesuit theologians and approved by Vice-Provincial Pacheco on 8 July 1669, also checked by 4 Jesuits experts in theology and approved by Vice-Provincial Gouvea on 4 March 1670; BNF, ms. Espagnol 409: ff. 144–150; BVE, ms. Fondo Gesuitico 1250/3: ff. 144r–235v, with Chinese characters, and with original approvals of Gouvea (f. 145) and of Pacheco (f. 146) with the seal of Vice-Provincial; Archives jésuites de Vanves, ms. GBrotier 105: *Dissertatio theologico-historica*, ff. 119r–342v & *Epilogus seu praxis*: ff. 344r–354v (July 1669). Publication: *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta*, Paris: Nicolas Pépie, 1700, 461 pages. In the book preface, the editor explains the context of the Rite Controversy (Praefatio, 9 pages). Then follow the authorizations to publish by Gouvea (2 pages) and to print in Paris (Extrait du privilège du Roi, dated 15 May 1700).
- Le Faure. 1668a. *Appendix*, 10 January 1688; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 77r–79v; ms. Jap.Sin.150, ff. 88v–90v (3a via); Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 328v–331v; authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668. Printed Version: Le Faure, *De sinensium ritibus*, 1700, Chapter 4, Number 22: 346–51.
- Le Faure. 1668b. Letter to Da Gama, 17 November 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 50r–55v, authenticated by Da Gama on 9 January 1669. Le Faure acknowledged that he has received instructions from Da Gama that no one should wear a hat during Mass and Litanies, but he gave six reasons not to obey.
- Leonardo. 1668b. *Respuestas a unas objeciones de las cortesías de los bonetes de China &ª firmado por varios PP. en la reclusión de Canton (incluido el VP. Fr. Antonio de Sta. María)*, Archives of the Santo Tomás Convent (APSR, Avila, Spain), Sección Ritos Chinos 035, Tomo 3, ms. Tratados misceláneos (1637, 1669, 1717), Carpeta 6, ff. 324v–330v, 17 September 1668; Respuesta a unas objeciones que se hazen a cerca de la cortesías de los bonetes de China, the different date of 17 November 1668; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 171r–179v.
- Longobardo. 1668. *Resposta breve sobre as Controversias do Xamtý, Tien Xin, Lím hoên*; copied by Caballero in original Portuguese, 1668; Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF), Paris, Ms. Espagnol 409, fol. 82r–101v. Total of 38 pages. For a modern edited and annotated version, see Thierry Meynard and Daniel Canaris, *A Brief Response on the Controversies over Shangdi, Tianshen and Linghun*, Singapore: Palgrave, 2021.
- Navarrete. 1669a. Letter to Da Gama; dated 17 April 1669; ms. BNF Espagnol 409: ff. 131r–138v, with 33 points; published in *Controversias*, 344–55, with 28 points.
- Navarrete. 1669b. Commentary on Brancati's report, 1669; published in *Controversias*, 356–410.
- Navarrete. 1669c. *Treslado de verbo ad verbum de hum papel que firmado de sua mão o R.P. Fr. Domingo de Navarrete Presidente dos Religiosos de Santo Domingo, que estão aqui com nos en nosta casa, offerendose à concordar con nos no das ceremonias controversas entre elles e nos, de que usaõ os Chinos con o seu Confucio*, 29 September 1669; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162: ff. 293r–294v. Cópia de alguns pontos de una consulta que tuvieron los RR.PP. de la Compania en la Metropoli de Chekiam por el Abril del

- Año 1642, 1 October 1669; Ajuda, ms. 44-XII-40: ff. 162–163 & ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 412r–414v; Provincial Archive of Dominicans in Manila, published in *Apologia pro decreto*, Louvain, 1700, 74–79, in *Acta cantoniensis authentica*, 73–74 (without the resolution of the Hangzhou conference), and in Boxer, *A propósito dum livrinho xilográfico dos jesuitas de Pequim (século XVIII)*, Macau: Imprensa Nacional, 1947, 1–5. French translation published as: “Acte donné au Père Antoine de Govea Jésuite Vice-Provincial de la Chine par le Révérend Père Dominique Navarrete, supérieur des Religieux Dominicains, prisonniers pour la foi à Canton en 1669,” “De quelques points arrestez dans une assemblée de la Compagnie de Jésus, Capitale de la Province de Chekiam au mois d’Avril de l’année 1642.” In Charles Le Gobien, *Histoire de l’édit*, 275–84, reproduced in Etienne, *Les Jésuites en Chine*. Paris: Juillard, 1966, 99–100. See also José María González. *Historia de las misiones dominicanas de China*. Vol. 1. 446–52.
- Navarrete. 1668a. Letter to Da Gama, 22 April 1668; Spanish manuscript copy: *Todo Ad Majorem Gloriam Dei, et sub correctione Sanctae Matris Ecclesiae*; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 197v–198v; Latin manuscript copy, Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 27v–28v: *Todo ad Majorem Dei gloriam, et sub correctione Sanctae Matris Ecclesiae*; Scriptum P. Dominici Navarrete et Tractatus R.P. Vasco Dominicani contra Ritus Sinicos. Published in *Controversias*, 332–34.
- Navarrete. 1668b. *Dudase si en China es conveniente que assistan los Christianos a la missa cubierta la cabeza* (Whether it is convenient in China that Christians attend Mass with the head covered), 25 September with additions on 2 October 1668; Archives of the Santo Tomás Convent (APSR, Avila, Spain), Sección Ritos Chinos 035, Tomo 3, *Tratados misceláneos* (1637, 1669, 1717), Carpeta 6, ff. 331r–342v. Other copy dated 9 October 1668, ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 20r–27v (original); Jap.Sin.150: 28r–33v (copy). Printed: *Controversias* (1679), 222–27.
- Pacheco. 1668. Answer to Navarrete, 18 April 1668; original document in Portuguese: BNF Espagnol 409: 140–140v, with 11 points; translated in Spanish and published in *Controversias*, 20 April 1668, 324–26, with 11 points.
- Rougemont. 1668b. Letter in Latin to Jesuit Superior General, 18 December 1668, in ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.162: ff. 249r–250v (1a via); published in: Henri Bosmans, “Lettres inédites de François de Rougemont,” *Analectes pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique de la Belgique* 3.9 (1913): Lettre n. 5, 38–42; Streit, *Bibliotheca missionum*, vol. 5, n. 2353.
- Sarpetri. 1670. *Breve noticia de unos de los fundamentos, que ay para permitir a los Cristianos Chinos el culto de Confucio y de los defunctos, que los permitió la Sagrada Congregación de la Universal Inquisición en tiempo del Papa Alejandro VII*, 30 September 1670; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 697r–713v; Provincial Archive of the Dominicans in Manila, t. 43, ff. 250–262; t. 30, ff. 33–40, t. 73, ff. 343–368; t. 87, ff. 39–44; t. 98, ff. 66–107 (see José María González, *Historia de las misiones dominicanas de China*, vol. 5, 122); Latin version: *Brevis explicatio rationum aliquarum, propter quas Christianis Sinensibus liber relinquitur usus caeremoniarum, quibus Confucius et progenitores suos venerantur, quemadmodum permisit Sacra Congregatio Inquisitionis Universalis sub Alexandro VII*, Canton, 31 October 1670. Printed Latin version: *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta, seu Appendix ad scripta R.P. Sarpetri Theologi ex Sancti Dominici Ordine, Missionarii Sinensis, De Deo Uno, Vivo ac Vero, A Veteribus Sinis per Duo Annorum Milla cognito, adversus scripta P. Longobardi S.J.*, Tractatus scriptus 20 Julii 1668. Paris: Nicolas Pépie, 1700, 82 pages, authenticated by Couplet. Another printed edition: *Apologia pro decreto*, 1700, 21–68. Sarpetri’s treatise is also mentioned with another Latin title: *Tractatus... ad lectionem Sacrae Theologiae Panormi approbati, quo refutat tractatum P. Longobardi e cineribus redivivum & defendet praxim Societatis in usu nominum, quibus Deus, Angeli, anima, etc.*, Canton, 1668; see *Acta cantoniensis authentica*, 70–71, 79–81. Sarpetri tells the circumstances of his report: “Me decidi a escribirles el siguiente tratadillo [a los Dominicos de Fukien], en el cual, no todas, sino

algunas razones de los dichos Padres Jesuitas (se refiere a los escritos de los jesuitas Brancato, Fabre y Gabiani). Acabélo en ocho o diez días y envíele a Fukien.”.

- Sarpetri. 1669. *Treslado em o qual promette de estar tambem elle pello assento de arriba*, 4 October 1669; Ajuda, ms. 44-XII-40:165. Latin translation: Sententia Reverendi Patris Frey Domici Sarpetri opiniones circa Sinas; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 78r–79v. Incipit: Ego Frater Dominicus Maria Sarpetrus, alias de Santo Petro, Siculus; APF, SOCG vol 432: ff. 457r–v; transcribed by Intorcetta on 21 April 1671 from the Jesuit Archives for Propaganda Fide. Published in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*: Declaratio Reverendi Patris Dominici a Sancto Petro vulgo Sarpetri de praecedenti R.P. Navarrete Praepositi sui scripto, data Patri Antonio de Gouvea Soc. Iesu in Pinarum Imperio Vice-Provinciali, Latina facta ex Hispanica, 77–79, also printed with same title in *Apologia pro decreto*: pp. 84–85. French translation published as: “Déclaration du Révérend Père Dominique de Saint Pierre au sujet de l’écrit du précédent du Révérend Père Navarrete, son supérieur, donnée au Révérend Père Antoine de Govea, Vice-Provincial des Jésuites de Chine,” in Le Gobien, *Histoire de l’édit*, 293–95. González mentions in his *Historia de las misiones dominicanas de China*, vol. 5, 122–25: “Un ejemplar de 347 X 220 mm., en el APD, t. 74, f. 56.”.
- Sarpetri. 1668a. Letter to Intorcetta (then in Macao), 25 September 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.158: ff. 8r–v; copy: IRFA, ms. AMEP Procure de Rome 235: ff. 441–470. Excerpts published in original Spanish with Latin translation in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, 55–58.
- Sarpetri. 1668b. Letter to Intorcetta (then in Macao), 2 November 1668, in Spanish; Jap.Sin.150: ff. 34r–34v. Excerpts quoted in original Spanish with Latin translation in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, 55–58.
- Sarpetri. 1668c. Letter to Da Gama, 18 November 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.150: ff. 36r–v. Excerpts quoted in original Spanish with Latin translation in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, 59–60.
- Sarpetri. 1668d. Letter to Da Gama, on 11 December 1668; ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin.158: f. 49; quoted in original Spanish with Latin translation in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, 61–62.
- Sarpetri. 1668e. *Fides seu Testimonium de praxi missionariorum Sinensium è Societate Jesu circa Confucium et progenitores defunctos*. Original ms. from the hand of Sarpetri, 4 August 1668; Archives jésuites de Vanves, GBrotier 94.10: 62r–63v (with manuscript note by Couplet, dated 3 december 1685, attesting that the document is from Sarpetri’s hand). Copy: Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 143v–144v & 349r–351v; APF, SOCG (1672) v. 432, ff. 457r–458r. Published in French translation in Gilles Estrix: Aegidius Estrix S.J., *Diatriba theologica de sapientia Dei beneficia optimi mundi architecta, et gubernatrix optima* (Antwerp: Apud Michaellem Cnobbaert, 1672), 241–44; also, Michel Le Tellier, *Défense des nouveaux Chrestiens et des Missionnaires de la Chine, du Japon, et des Indes* (Paris 1687), 212–19; *Apologia pro decreto*, Louvain, 1700, 3–7. Mention by José María González, *Historia de las misiones dominicas de China*, vol. 5, 122–25, as “Libellus assertorius in gratiam methodi quo utuntur PP. S. J. in Sinensium conversione, permitiendo ipsis seu Confucii seu parentum defunctorum cultum. Kuang-tung, 4 de agosto de 1668.” Recent study: Daniel Canaris, Cultural Translatability in the China Mission: Domenico Sarpetri’s Defense of Jesuit Accommodationism (to be published).
- Sarpetri. 1668f. *Ad Sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide*, 12 November 1668; APF, ms. SOCG vol 432: ff. 450r–451v, 456r–v, 459r (Italian), ff. 452r–455v (Spanish); ARSI, ms. Fondo Gesuitico 724/2; BNF, ms. Espagnol 409: 117r–119v; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 352r–356r. Published in *Défense des nouveaux Chrestiens et des Missionnaires de la Chine, du Japon, et des Indes contre deux livres intitulés La Morale pratique des Jésuites, et l’esprit de M. Arnauld I* (Paris 1688), 225–32, resp. 214f; in Latin translation in *Apologia pro decreto*, Louvain, 1700, 8–20. Quoted in Latin translation in *Acta cantoniensia authentica*, 68–69.
- Sarpetri. 1667. *Testimonium de libro sinico P. Matthaei Riccii qui inscribitur Tien-chu Xe-y*, 9 May 1667. Incipit: Ego infrascriptus F. Dominicus Maria Sarpetrus, Ordinis Praedicatorum Lector; APF, SOCG, vol. 432: f. 458r, transcribed by Intorcetta on 21 April 1671 from the Jesuit Archives for Propaganda Fide; BNF,

ms. Espagnol 409: 116r; Ajuda, ms. 49-IV-62: ff. 79r–81r & 351v–352r. Published in *Apologia pro decreto*, Louvain, 1700, 1–2. See Cummins. *The Travels and Controversies* 2: 414–15.
 Sarpetri. 1666. Letter to Superior General, 15 October 1666, ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico: 69r–70v.

Secondary Sources

- Bontinck, François. 1962. *La Lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*. Louvain: Nauwelaerts.
- Canaris, Daniel. 2024. “Cultural Translatability in the China Mission: Domenico Sarpetri’s Defense of Jesuit Accommodationism.” In *Translation as Practice: Intercultural Encounters, China, and the Creation of Global Modernities*, edited by Filippo Marsili, and Eugenio Menegon. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press series, Edinburgh Studies in Comparative Political Theory and Intellectual History. (forthcoming).
- González, José María. 1964. *Historia de la misiones dominicanas de China 1632–1700*, Vol. 1. Madrid: Juan Bravo.
- Meynard, Thierry, and Hongfan Yang. 2021. “To Wear or Not to Wear a Hat during Mass? The Canton Conference and Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis’s Report of 1668.” *AHSI* 179 (1): 5–61.
- Rule, Paul. 2021. *K’ung-tzu or Confucius? The Jesuit Interpretation of Confucius*. Brompton: Australian Theological Forum.
- Yang, Hongfan 楊虹帆. 2021. ““Laihua chuanjiaoshi de jijin wenti” 來華傳教士的祭巾問題.” *Guoji hanxue* 國際漢學 26 (1): 115–20.
- Yip, Keith 葉家祺. 2012. ““Guangdong huiyi (1667–1668) sishiertiao tiaowen de yiyi” 廣州會議 (1667–1668) 四十二條條文的意義.” *Daofeng* 道風 37: 277–316.